

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1895

REI-JEU CHANG,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JAMES S. MAXWELL; DANIEL S. WILLARD; YUE TIAN;
FLOYD WILLIS, Temporary Trustee,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 00-1900

RICHARD CHANG,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JAMES S. MAXWELL; YUE TIAN,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, District Judge. (CA-
00-740-PJM, CA-00-495-PJM)

Submitted: August 28, 2001

Decided: October 1, 2001

Before WILLIAMS, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ning Ye, HEMENWAY & ASSOCIATES, Washington, D.C.; John D. Hemenway, Washington, D.C., for Appellants. Brian M. Barke, MAXWELL & CO., L.L.C., Rockville, Maryland; Edward J. Hutchins, Jr., Stacey A. Moffet, ECCLESTON & WOLF, P.C., Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In appeal No. 00-1895, Rei-Jeu Chang appeals from the district court's order abstaining from exercising jurisdiction under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) (1994), to address Rei-Jeu's claim of ownership of the stock of Erie Trade Inc. In appeal No. 00-1900, Richard Chang appeals from the district court's orders (1) dismissing under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) his complaint alleging that Yue Tian and James Maxwell engaged in conduct intended to inflict emotional distress upon him, and (2) denying his motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the briefs, the joint appendices, and the district court's opinions and find no abuse of discretion and no reversible error. See Wilton v. Seven Falls Co., 515 U.S. 277, 286-87 (1995) (holding that district court has broad discretion to abstain from exercising jurisdiction under § 2201(a)); Harris v. Jones, 380 A.2d 611, 613 (Md. 1977) (setting forth elements of cause of action for intentional infliction of emotional distress).

Accordingly, we affirm in both of these appeals on the reasoning of the district court. Chang v. Maxwell, No. CA-00-740-PJM (D. Md. filed June 22, 2000; entered June 23, 2000), and Chang v. Maxwell, No. CA-00-495-PJM (D. Md. filed Apr. 25, 2000; entered Apr. 26, 2000 & filed June 1, 2000; entered June 2, 2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED